1

□[270;180 G

1	BEFORE THE	
2	LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	
3		
4		
5	In the Matter of:	
6	A DRAFT WATER DISCHARGE PERMIT JBD, L.L.C., JBD CONSTRUCTION	Wa 122020
7	and DEMOLITION LANDFILL	NO. 132838
8		
9		
10	PUBLIC MEETING	
11	JUNE 17, 2008	6:15 P.M.
12	BURTON COLISEUM	
13	7001 GULF HIGHWAY	
14	LAKE CHARLES, LOUISIANA	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1		deqmeet APPEARANC	E S	
	2				
ALLEN	3	KIRKPATRICK		BEFORE:	MR.
HEARING	3	OFFICER			
LOUISIANA	ı	DEPARTMENT OF			
	4	ENVIRONMENTAL		QUALITY	
	5			QUALITI	
	6			REPORTED BY:	AVA
LUNDQUIST	,	CVR		KEI GRIED DIT	71171
	7	CVIC		CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER	
	8				
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12				
	13				
	14				
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right. We're going
3	to start the hearing. Can y'all hear me in the
4	back?
5	Good. If you can't hear me well, I
6	guess it wouldn't do you any good to raise your
7	hand if you can't hear me. So, let me know, and
8	I'll use the mic.
9	Good evening. Let the record reflect that
10	the time is 6:15 p.m. My name is Allen
11	Kirkpatrick. I am employed with the Louisiana
12	Department of Environmental Quality. I will be
13	serving as the Hearing Officer this evening, June
14	17th, 2008.
15	This hearing is scheduled to accept public
16	comments concerning a Draft Water Discharge Permit
17	for J.B.D., L.L.C., 8222 Highway 90, Roanoke,
18	Louisiana 70581, for their J.B.D. Construction and
19	Demolition Landfill. Agency Interest Number is
20	132838. Permit Number is LA0123501. Activity
21	Tracking Number is PER20080001. The facility is
22	located at 8655 Joe Ledoux Road, Lake Charles,
23	Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana.
24	J.B.D., L.L.C., proposes to discharge
25	contact storm water from their J.B.D. Construction
	4
1	and Demolition Landfill.
2	The principal discharge from this existing
	Page 3

degmeet

source is made into a parish drainage ditch, thence into the Calcasieu River in subsequent 031101 of the Calcasieu River Basin, waters of the state classified for primary contact recreation, secondary contact recreation, and propagation of fish and wildlife. Under the S.I.C. Code 4953, the applicant proposes to discharge contact storm water from the J.B.D. Construction and Demolition Landfill.

This hearing is not being conducted in a question and answer format. Please remember that the purpose of this public hearing is for L.D.E.Q. to receive your comments concerning a Draft Water Discharge Permit.

This hearing is to provide all individuals a chance to be heard regardless of their position on the Draft Water Discharge Permit.

Courteous behavior is expected of everyone at all times. You may speak in support of or in opposition to this Draft Water Discharge Permit or simply to provide additional information. All interested persons will be given a reasonable opportunity to comment unless testimony is not

related to the purpose of the hearing. Your							
comments will be evaluated and addressed in the							
Department's written response.							
A public notice advertising this Public							
Hearing and Request for Public Comment on the Draft							

٨	۵	~	m	^	^	+
(1	$\boldsymbol{\omega}$	(1	m	μ	μ	т

Water Discharge Permit was published on Thursday,
May 15th, 2008, in the American Press, Lake
Charles, and also in The Advocate, Baton Rouge,
Louisiana.

Copies of the material associated with the Draft Water Discharge Permit are available for inspection and review at L.D.E.Q., Public Records Center, Room 127, 602 North Fifth Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Viewing hours are 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, except holidays. Additional copies are available for review at the Calcasieu Parish Central Library, 301 W. Claude Street, Lake Charles, Louisiana 70605, and also at the Calcasieu Public Library, Sulphur Regional Branch, 1160 Cypress Street, Sulphur, Louisiana 70663.

The available information can also be accessed electronically on the Electronic Document Management System (E.D.M.S.) on the D.E.Q. public website at www.deq.louisiana.gov.

In addition, copies of the public notice
announcing this public hearing were mailed Monday,
May 12, 2008, via the U.S. Postal Service and via
e-mail to individuals who have requested to be
placed on the mailing list maintained by the
L.D.E.Q, Office of Environmental Services.
In accordance with Louisiana Administrative
Code, Title 33, Part IX, Section 3113.B, comments

Page 5

9	deqmeet received by 12:30 p.m., Monday, June 23rd, 2008,
10	will be considered prior to a final decision. All
11	comments heard and transcribed during this hearing
12	and all written comments received by 12:30 p.m.,
13	Monday, June 23, 2008, shall be retained by the
14	Department and considered in determining whether to
15	issue or deny the requested permit.
16	Written comments on the Draft Water
17	Discharge Permit may be submitted to Ms. Soumaya
18	Ghosn, L.D.E.QO.E.S., Environmental Assistance
19	Division, P.O. Box 4313, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
20	70821-4313.
21	Under Louisiana Revised Statutes 30:2017,
22	as revised by the legislature in the 2004 session,
23	the Department is required to follow the following
24	order of speakers with the provision that the
25	presiding officer may give preference to a public
	7
1	
1	official to speak at any time during the hearing.
2	However, any time limit set for citizen testimony
3	shall apply to public officials.
4	The Department must provide up to 30
5	minutes to the permit applicant for an introductory
6	presentation. Thereafter, the preference for
7	speaking up to one hour is given as follows:
8	For the first hour, to those citizens who
9	live within a two-mile radius of the location of
10	the facility:

11

Page 6

For the second hour, to those citizens who

	deqmeet
12	work within a two-mile radius of the location of
13	the facility;
14	And for the third hour, to those citizens
15	who live within the parish of the location of the
16	facility.
17	Thereafter, each hour of the hearing shall
18	alternate between those who are in support of the
19	Draft Water Discharge Permit and those who are
20	opposed to it.
21	The order of speakers for tonight's hearing
22	will be based on information provided on the by
23	the speaker on the registration form. Those are
24	these right here (indicating). Anyone who
25	registered to speak but did not provide the
	9
	8
1	necessary information will be given the opportunity
2	to speak; however, they will be called last in the
3	order of registration.
4	This hearing is being transcribe;
5	therefore, each speaker should begin his or her
6	comments by stating for the record their name,
7	address, and any organization he or she may
8	represent.

I would remind you to please turn off or silence all cell phones and other electronic devices, which I haven't done myself. So, I will do that right now. There you go. Thank you.

At this time, the permit applicant's representative may come forward and make their

	degmeet
15	introductory presentation. Thank you.
16	Are they here?
17	Anita Peterson?
18	MS. PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Kirkpatrick.
19	My name is Anita Peterson. Address 18369 Petroleum
20	Drive, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. That is my business
21	address. I am here representing the client,
22	J.B.D., L.L.C., tonight.
23	I'd like to start by giving you all just a
24	short history of the facility. Mr. Mike Gilliam
25	operated this particular piece of property as a
	9
1	dirt pit, which I am certain all of you understand.
2	He had removed most of the saleable dirt prior to
3	Hurricane Rita hitting here, and at that point in
4	time, FEMA and the Corp of Engineers went to every
5	parish in south Louisiana that was affected by the
6	hurricane, went to the police juries, and,
7	basically, told them, "Find us some place to put
8	all these millions of tons of waste."
9	This waste was composed of what they
10	generally call "storm debris," which was trees,
11	woody plants. Any buildings, dwellings that were
12	destroyed or damaged beyond repair were also
13	included in this.
14	Not included in this were the contents of a
15	house, that being furniture, refrigerators, stoves,
16	those things we generally call "white goods." That

17

would be televisions, microwaves -- y'all all have

18	deqmeet them in your house those don't go in C and D
19	landfills.
20	Mr. Gilliam operated this facility under
21	the close scrutiny of the L.D.E.Q., FEMA, and the
22	Corp of Engineers. He was allowed to place these
23	materials that I just named in the site.
24	About three months into the disposal
25	operations, E.P.A. realized that there was a lot of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

10

non-friable asbestos in these old houses. A lot of people that built houses back in the early '50s, the late '40s, had this nice stuff on the outside of them that didn't need painting. We called it "Transite." Y'all called it "house siding." A lot of this material had to be removed. It's considered by E.P.A., FEMA, and D.E.Q. as what's called "non-friable asbestos." What that means is, the fibers are not going to dissipate into the air as long as you don't do something like run over them with a bulldozer, purposefully crush them.

There is a four-acre area at the back of Mr. Gilliam's site that he has had written permission to dispose of non-friable asbestos. This material was brought in after it had been wet at the site where it was removed from the dwelling, hauled to the site, immediately brought back. They already -- they had to have a hole dug back there. Dirt was immediately placed on top of it.

The other parts of his operation were, as I

21	deqmeet explained, he and all of the other facilities, to
22	keep from filling them up, were allowed to burn
23	tree debris, not C and D, something totally
24	different. One is part of a house; the other is
25	part of a tree or a bush.
	11
1	He burned these materials on top of an
2	inactive part of his landfill. When he was through
3	burning it, he put the wood ash, same kind of stuff
4	y'all got in your fireplaces at home, in the
5	landfill, covered it up.
6	Approximately in April of 2007, Mr. Gilliam
7	was notified that they no longer needed the use of
8	his emergency, hurricane disposal site. He was
9	given an order to close the facility.
10	D.E.Q. gave him precise instructions on how
11	to close it that consisted of developing slopes.
12	It's what we call a "three to one slope." What a
13	three to one slope is, is if you go in three feet,
14	you come up one foot. It makes a small slope
15	there. This is done to allow rain water to run off
16	of the facility. It's done in a small slope simply
17	to prevent erosion at the site.
18	On top of this waste, they place two feet
19	of re-compacted clay, which, as you know, doesn't
20	wash off very well, and then half a foot of
21	topsoil, and then it was seeded.
22	Mr. Gilliam had a local engineer go out,
23	bore holes in the facility to make certain that

				deq							
24	there	was	two	feet	of	clay	and	six	inches	of	top
25	soil.										

These borings were then filled with what is called "bentonite." It's a real sticky clay. It's typically used in landfills to fill bore holes.
This engineer certified that what D.E.Q. required was out there. D.E.Q. then signed off on this site.

I think what is sort of bothering everybody right now, he only used half of his site. The other half of it, the western side of it, has good clay under it just like the other side had. That's why he was in the dirt business. He was selling clay.

You see a lot of water out there. Well, when you've got a clay bottom in something, it's like if you put your bathtub out in the backyard and you put a plug in the bottom of it. It's not going to drain. So, he's got water out there, rain water that has fallen into that area on the western side of it. This water seems to be the major area of concern for a lot of people. They seem to think it's contaminated.

Looking at the materials that went into the landfill, it's the same thing that's on your house right now. It's shingles and 2-by-4's. When it rains at your house, do you run out in the yard and

□

collect the water because you're afraid it's
contaminated? No. It's the same material. His is
even better; he's got clay on top of it. So, the
rain that's falling right now is not hitting the
waste.

Let's get to my present client, because Mr. Gilliam is not my client. As you all saw, there is that area out there with the water in it. As it continues to rain, it's going to fill up. It may even overflow. My client cannot control this. The only way he can ever handle that water, treat that water, or discharge that water is if he has a water discharge permit, and if it keeps raining, it's going to go out the ditch and down the road. Y'all may have something to complain about then, but, unfortunately, that's just a pond right now. It's not a landfill.

Should my client receive the water permit and the associated construction demolition landfill, he will be under very close scrutiny of D.E.Q. This is called a "standard permit." This is what's issued when you aren't in an emergency condition like we had after the hurricane. D.E.Q., E.P.A., and everybody else sort of did things like they do in an emergency. They did not require

standard permits. They didn't require water Page 12

2	discharge permits.
3	So, now my client has come up I don't
4	know about y'all, but I wouldn't want a pond
5	sitting out there with just open to the public,
6	which is what that is right now. Your kids could
7	go over there and, you know, play in it and drown.
8	I hate to you know, I realize nobody likes
9	landfills, but that facility would be much better
10	off if they were allowed to place construction
11	demolition debris.
12	It's a lot of people building houses now.
13	That stuff has got to go somewhere. It's still
14	people tearing down their old houses. It has to go
15	somewhere. It would be operated under the
16	requirements of a solid-waste permit granted by the
17	D.E.Q., requiring cover on it. They would have to
18	test the water once a month prior to discharge.
19	Basically, that's all I have to say about
20	it. We you have two options: a facility that's
21	totally unregulated right now or a facility where
22	you can rely on D.E.Q. to force them to operate it
23	properly. Thank you.
24	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you, Ms. Peterson
25	All right. I will allow I will now
	15
	13
1	begin by allowing all persons who have signed up to
2	speak five minutes to present their comments.
3	Anyone who needs more than five minutes will be
4	allowed to complete his or her comments after all Page 13

5	the registered speakers have had the opportunity to
6	speak.
7	Let me let you know how we will do this:
8	When you're speaking, if you get close, when four
9	minutes has gone by, I will hold my finger up like
10	that (indicating), and that means one. When you
11	get to your five minutes, I'll do like that
12	(indicating). That's probably better, and that
13	will mean your time. If you need extra time to
14	speak, you just tell me, and I'll be sure and make
15	a note of it and hold your sign-in sheet off to the
16	side, okay?
17	The first to speak will be those citizens
18	who live within a two-mile radius of the location
19	of the facility. The first person signed in is
20	Nancy Higginbotham.
21	Please give your name and address and all
22	that.
23	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: My name is Nancy
24	Higginbotham. I am presently living on Budstell
25	Road, and I represent the community of Joe Ledoux
	16
1	and the Budstell area.
2	First, I want to thank Ms. Gosen for
3	allowing us to hold the meeting off so we can have
4	all our people here, due to the other conflict.

5

6

7

allowing us to hold the meeting off so we can have all our people here, due to the other conflict.

Thank you very much.

I am going to be quoting from a letter that I have that's going to be sent to D.E.Q. by Ms.

Page 14

	•
8	Wilma Subra, who is an environmentalist out of New
9	Iberia, Louisiana, from Subra Company. So, I hope
10	I can get all of this in, in five minutes.
11	In her opening comments, Ms. Subra states
12	that the reopening and additional disposal of
13	construction and demolition debris at this location
14	is inappropriate.
15	Her next section in her letter talks about
16	inconsistent waste streams to be disposed, and I
17	won't go into all that.
18	She has her next section, which is
19	titled "Toxic Waste Already Disposed of and on the
20	Site" and Ms. Subra received all her
21	information, and we have also, on the D.E.Q.
22	E.D.M.S. website. She states in a section of this
23	letter that the hurricane construction and
24	demolition debris waste streams already disposed of
25	at the site include toxic waste streams, in
	17
1	addition to the construction and demolition debris
2	waste streams.
3	She also goes on to state that Sheetrock
4	and insulation, furniture, treated, untreated
5	lumber, municipal solid waste, (inaudible) scribed
6	solid waste, household hazardous waste, electronic
7	waste, asbestos, and many other liquid, solid toxic
8	waste streams.

She also goes on to state that this pit was not properly lined, and it consists of sandy soils Page 15

9

11	in contact with shallow ground-water resources.
12	The potential to contaminate the surface ground-
13	water resources and the marshland environments are
14	very high.
15	She also goes on to state that reopening
16	additional addition of waste to the site that
17	already poses a threat to human and health
18	environment is unacceptable.
19	She has another section in here for
20	additional stricter toxic monitor requirements and
21	discharge limits.
22	Her next section, "Failure to Apply for
23	Non-Contact Uncontaminated Storm Water Discharge,"
24	was the most important to me. She states, "In
25	application for a solid waste permit, the applicant
	18
	10

stated, 'Temporary berms will be constructed to
separate and direct contaminated runoff from
uncontaminated storm water.'" This is an E.D.M.S.
document, Number 36339600, page 18 of 130. We have
that available if you need to see it. The
applicant only applied for a discharge permit for
contaminated storm water associated with
construction demolition debris and wood waste.
She also found in E.D.M.S. document numbe
36573099, page 21 of 99, that the applicant failed
to apply for a non-contact, uncontaminated storm
water discharge. Thus the permit application
should be denied. Page 16

14

Her next section is "Lack of Treatment."

15	In application for the M.P.D.S. contact wastewater
16	discharge permit, it indicates that there is no
17	need for treatment of storm water anticipated. The
18	D.E.Q. regulations require that the construction
19	and demolition debris only be covered every 30
20	days. Thus the storm water will be contaminated
21	with chemicals and disposed-of waste and will also
22	possibly be contaminated by the leachate chemicals
23	and the disposed of waste and will also, possibly,
24	be contaminated from waste disposed of during the
25	previous disposal activities that occurred at the
	19
1	site.
2	The application should have required that
3	the facility include adequate treatment of waste
4	water in order to remove suspended and dissolvable
5	particulate materials, toxic heavy materials,
6	ammonia, volatile and semi-volatile organic
7	chemicals. The lack of proposed treatment is
8	unacceptable, will result in contamination of the
9	surface water resources in the area, and should be
10	used as a reason to deny the permit.
11	She also speaks on the existing water on
12	the site.
13	Is my time up?
14	MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's not up yet. Go or
15	Keep on going.
16	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: "The Lack of Need" is Page 17

another section that she has in here. In June of

18	'07, this pit was deemed no longer necessary. In
19	October of '07, this J.B.D. landfill applicant
20	stated that they would assist in managing
21	tremendous amount of wood waste, construction and
22	demolition debris waste, and waste that has
23	accumulated in the area since the recent
24	hurricanes. Well, 12 months
25	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your time is up. You
	20
	20
1	will need to wrap it up.
2	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm almost done. I have
3	about one minute left.
4	MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right.
5	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: This is 12 months after
6	a hurricane, and there is no longer a need for
7	hurricane disposal.
8	The ground water monitoring wells, which is
9	very important, one to ten feet is where we hit
10	water. The soils at the site are silty fine and
11	sandy silty clay. It's unacceptable for locating a
12	construction and demolition debris. Previous
13	disposal and operations inappropriate. Tests were
14	performed quickly to address this disposal during
15	Hurricane Rita.
16	She has a little bit more, but since my
17	time is up, I'll go ahead and let the next speaker
18	
19	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would you like to submit Page 18

that as an exhibit?

20

21	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: Well, Ms. Subra is going
22	to send this letter to D.E.Q. I mean, I have it
23	highlighted and marked all over, and it's not very
24	pretty.
25	MR. KIRKPATRICK: We don't care if it's
	21
	
1	pretty.
2	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: These are a book.
3	MR. KIRKPATRICK: I want your book.
4	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: Okay.
5	MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right. Natalie
6	Robinson?
7	MS. ROBINSON: Hello. My name is Natalie
8	Robinson. I live at 8668 Budstell Road. We lost
9	our home at 8650 Budstell Road during the
10	hurricane, and I am here speaking on behalf of the
11	community, also.
12	Our largest concern right off the bat is
13	that yesterday morning Calcasieu Parish Planning
14	and Zoning just received the new Federal flood maps
15	that FEMA has worked on for two and a half years.
16	The part that the the area that Mr. Pousson is
17	asking to be permitted is zoned V.E., which the new
18	zoning for V.E., what they describe that to be, is
19	"special flood hazzard, which is subject to high
20	velocity waters from tidal surge."
21	We are in a flood zone out there, and we
22	have documentation that of all of the Page 19

24

25

23	contaminants that went into that landfill, and if
24	we happen to have another storm, any type of
25	situation in Calcasieu Parish where the water comes
	22
1	up, not only us as a community, it's going to
2	affect all of Calcasieu Parish. It's going to
3	bring what we're fighting right here into
4	everyone's back yard, and that is the back portion.
5	Where the four acres that Ms. Anita Peterson was
6	speaking of, where the asbestos was received, that
7	part is in a V.E. zone.
8	On the application that Mr. Pousson had
9	filled out, it speaks about the information, as far
10	as any ideas or any knowledge to any contaminants
11	or anything that went into that landfill, and on
12	record he is noted as stating that there is nothing
13	no contamination, nothing of any substantial
14	what would you say substantial material in that
15	area that would harm us. Well, in his application,
16	he states that the water is contaminated, and he
17	does have and he is working on a special plan to
18	remove the contaminated water, and that is in his
19	own words, his own writing, in his D.E.Q.
20	application.
21	The other thing, as far as the bore testing
22	that Ms. Peterson spoke of, we have the
23	documentation of the bore testing, and the clay
	assumentation of the soft testing, and the tray

that she speaks of, there is one -- it was bore

tested three times, is all we were able to find on Page $20\,$

D.E.Q.'s site. Not 300. Well, there is one
particular bore site that was drilled that is a,
possibly, acceptable to D.E.Q. under their
standards, but it would have to be reviewed by a
geologist. This is the exact words of a D.E.Q.
employee in the solid waste department.
The other two sites, bore site 2 and bore
site 3, silty clay, tan silty fine sand, silty clay
matrix. These here would definitely not pass.
As far as the pit being lined, it is
required to have clay along the sides of it. If it
does not have clay, then the D.E.Q. representative
told me that they haul clay in and pack it along
the sides and the bottom of the landfill. There is
no clay along the sides, and the bore testing is
showing that the bore testing is showing that it
is not conducive to what D.E.Q. standards are to
approve it.
That's it?
One minute?
MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do you need to come back?
MS. ROBINSON: Yes, sir, if I may.
MR. KIRKPATRICK: Okay. I'll keep you off

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, sir.

to the side.

1	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Joseph Bourque?
2	MR. BOURQUE: Joseph Bourque.
3	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You have to give your
4	address.
5	MR. BOURQUE: 8639 Joe Ledoux Road,
6	bordering the dirt pit, or trash dump.
7	That lady up there that come and spoke
8	first, I have a drink of water our of my water
9	well. It's about 75 to 80 feet away from this
10	contaminated dump you're talking about that's
11	clean. If you would like to have some, here it is.
12	Also, they talking about this clay liner
13	they put down. There's clay on top of the dirt,
14	and trash and all that. There is washed out spots
15	where the trash is exposed. There is trash on top
16	of the trash hole they are calling covered up now.
17	I live right there. I can walk right outside and
18	see trash out of my back door that is supposed to
19	be covered up. It's not. We got documentation
20	showing asbestos on top of the ground that's
21	underneath the water now, that they're going to
22	wish to pump out.
23	You want to pump it out into our waterways.
24	You're affecting everybody fishing, swimming,
25	hunting, the whole thing.

1 2 25

Also, we've been in and out the hospital for the last two years. I have sores on my feet,

Page 22

3	deqmeet my hands, stomach issues. My dogs died. I have
4	another dog that has cancer growing on it all over
5	the place. I've had horses that died. Another
6	lady has had a horse die. I have a sister that is
7	ate up from head to toe with cancer. All this is
8	since this trash dump jump on and non-contaminated
9	has been put in.
10	None of y'all live there, and I would be
11	happy to have y'all come over, drink my water, take
12	a shower at my house. Smell the stuff that we have
13	to smell. Pay for the bottled water we've bee

a shower at my house. Smell the stuff that we have to smell. Pay for the bottled water we've bee paying for for these last few years since this dump come along. None of you will.

The lady that come spoke is from Baton Rouge. She has no clue what we got over here.

None. You're representing the wrong people. You need to come represent on our side.

As far as the trash that's in there, the storm debris, I was sitting there watching it.
We've got batteries, car batteries. We've got household stuff. The white garbage they talk about was in there everyday with the trees that was being burnt. This stuff was burned with trees. It's

buried in the hole. We were supposed to not have
trash being hauled in there in the middle of the
night, when we did. We've got 55-gallon drums in
this hole that's been covered up.
Y'all are hiding things, which is all about
Dago 22

6	deqmeet your money. I can understand that. Everybody
7	wants to get rich off the poor. Well, you're
8	killing me. You're trying to kill me, you're
9	trying to kill my kids, you're trying to kill my
10	wife, you're trying to kill my sister, the whole
11	neighborhood.
12	That's about all I have to say. It just
13	best not open.
14	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tammie Hardv?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tammie Hardy?

MS. HARDY: Good evening. My name is Tammie Hardy, and I live at 8530 Joe Ledoux Road.

Our concerns that this water runoff proposal involve events and facts from the existing Gilliam-Rita pit. Due to our personal witnessing and living in this close proximity of this area, watching what was hauled in, what was burned, what was placed everywhere we couldn't even imagine, we have severe questions and refer to different, previous sightings from D.E.Q. to Mr. Gilliam on infractions and concerns and improper handling at

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

1

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

27

this site, to question impact of what this is going to do to our environment as well as what this runoff will do.

These are a few sightings from the fieldinterview forms and pictures -- we do have pictures to confirm these sightings. Pictures -- and other pictures, by the way -- pictures to confirm these facts. According to field interview form dated

9	8/23/06, there were several areas of concerns
10	noted. The owner, Mr. Gilliam, was cited for
11	failure to maintain records of location, depth, and
12	areas of A.C.U.M. on map or diagram.
13	On 9/11 owner failed to furnish proof of
14	receipt for submitting operations and monitoring
15	results and was referred for reinforcement action.
16	None of these infractions are noted on the
17	interview forms as being corrected to the best of
18	my knowledge.
19	On 9/25/06, owner was cited for discharging
20	water off facility onto bordering pastures and
21	fallow fields. This some of it was Mr. Bourque.
22	We do have pictures of that. We have pictures of
23	Jager pump hoses run onto his land, bordering

24 25

1

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

28

be in these waters. That picture is so disgusting it makes you want to throw up. On 9/25/06, Mr. Gilliam was cited for receipts in mailbox but was not present at the time, no monitoring was being conducted. Mr. Gilliam's, according to the D.E.Q. paper, response was, it was his duty to be there but was out of the office today.

toxic or what kind of contaminants could possibly

pasture pictures, and this brings up a real hard

question, when you see these pictures, of just how

On 5/9/07, owner was cited with large amounts of exposed waste, large pile of wood waste,

deqmeet large -- loads of industrial hoses, rolled boxes of tires, areas of exposed debris along the side of the asbestos-dump area. He states in the letter that they asked him, he said he would clean it up and take care of this. How long were these things sitting exposed before D.E.O. found them? We also have pictures taken by Mr. Clayton Miller of D.E.Q. to view these concerns and questionable debris in the pit. Mr. Gilliam was fined as recently as January 2008 -- January 4, to be exact -- for nine infractions totaling 18,771 cited by D.E.Q. We

you would wish to go through them. Some of them are really pretty pertinent to what's going on and the failure and the -- the lack of records, the lack of maintenance, the lack of air quality records, lack of calibration on some of the equipment, it's enough to scare you.

have the paper to go through those nine citings if

We would like to say, as a community, that we lived through this. We lived every day with the dump trucks. We lived every day with the burning. Our children were not allowed to go outside when we saw the smoke. They were not allowed to play outside at night when we saw the fires. We had no idea what we were breathing, what we were putting up with. We do have lots of destruction on the

	deqmeet
15	block from the dump trucks. We have disintegrated
16	mail boxes. We have holes in yards where the
17	trucks ran off. I personally have a hole in my
18	yard where they had to get a track hoe to come get
19	it out of because it was fixing to dump over a load
20	of waste in my front yard.
21	We ask for your serious consideration
22	before letting something like this pass. The
23	pictures will be for viewing for anybody who would
24	like to see them after the meeting. Thank you.

Debra Weeks?

MS. WEEKS: Hi, my name is Debra Weeks. I live at 8538 Joe Ledoux Road. My great grandfather was Joseph M. Ledoux. My family has homesteaded this area for more years than any of us in this room have been alive.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you.

During the aftermath from Rita, we all lived in FEMA trailers. My FEMA trailer happened to have a door that faced the road, and we watched the dump trucks pass, and we watched the dump trucks pass, and we saw everything that went into the dump.

I have a report from Mark Bergeron. Mark was an operator at the FEMA site. This is a notarized statement from Mark, and he may be here and wish to speak to you afterwards, if I'm not mistaken. I'm going to read a direct quote which

	deameet
18	deqmeet has been witnessed and notarized from Mark
19	Bergeron. "I, Mark Bergeron, worked as an operator
20	during Hurricane Rita cleanup. This site was
21	located at 8655 Joe Ledoux Road. As an operator, I
22	buried various debris in this pit via track hoe and
23	dozier. Materials buried specifically were air
24	conditioners, refrigerators, freezers, tires,
25	washers, dryers, water heaters, paint, household
	24
	31
1	chemicals, propane bottles, and et cetera. The
2	clay in this pit was previously dug out for
3	construction use.
4 5	I am writing this in concern for the environmental issues and health issues for the
6 7	people living near and around the proposed J.B.D.
8	disposal site." Thank you. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Jamie Robinson?
9	MR. ROBINSON: Declined.
	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He didn't know he had
10 11	
	signed up.
12	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Okay. We don't make you
13	talk if you don't want to.
14	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I wasn't given my instructions.
15	
16	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can attend
17	anonymously.
18	COURT REPORTER: What was his name?
19	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Jamie Robinson.
20	Claude Devall?

Page 28

21	deqmeet MR. DEVALL: How you doing? My name is
22	Claude Devall. My address is 8560-X Big Lake Road,
23	which would be directly west of the landfill that
24	is already there.
25	I think there are a few different I
	32
1	guess four points that need to be made and
2	something that needs to be considered in the
3	-
	landfill. One, and I think they've all been hit
4	on, is the violations that already exist. It's the
5	recent opinions by ARGIS in favor of D.E.Q. which
6	clearly state that one of the criteria that has to
7	be considered and with substantial weight when
8	evaluating the necessity of such a permit, as
9	requested here, is: "Previous violations or
10	penalties have been placed on the owner, operator,
11	or in connection with the land site itself. It is
12	very important for a few reasons.
13	One is, I think it shows the bad acts that
14	have already happened.
15	Second, it also shows what they are
16	proposing that we pump back up.
17	This is a little bit of testimony from
18	various neighbors you will hear about the horror
19	stories they have seen dumped in that place. I can

20

21

22

23

Page 29

personally tell you I didn't see hundreds and

big tank that we took that washed up on our

hundreds of washing machines. I know two off of my

property: I know of a refrigerator; I know of a

		d	eq	me
property.	I	had	a	C

property. I had a conversation with the guy of exactly why it was being left there. It was

because of the hurricane. It was a different situation, and they needed a place to put them. This is one story of the -- I went there one day. This place, I know, worked from daylight to dark. If you would come home at ten or eleven at night, you could lets the lights coming out of it, and I don't think my situation was any different than anybody else's. They let anything be put in it because of the hurricane and because of the situation we were in. Why the folks are here today is, is the fact that now we want to pump it out and start the whole process over again.

The violations also go -- I think it's a question of how much involvement Gilliam is still going to have in this. I don't think he's a bad actor that's getting out. It was done for money in the first place, and it's still going to be done for money. It's pretty slick whenever you get somebody else to come in, pay you a whole lot of money for a piece of property in the event that this is passed, and in the event that there is going to be more waste on it.

In effect, what D.E.Q. is doing is, they would be rewarding somebody for beating the system, for violations they are not paying, and, like I

1	said, once again, it shows the knowledge of what
2	D.E.Q. already has in the hole.
3	Second, it's the manner in which the pit
4	was obtained, which I think is more of a technical
5	rule, but how the license was based upon a crisis.
6	It was opened under an emergency order, and
7	I think this matters for a few different reasons.
8	One is, it goes back to what has been put in the
9	hole. Many of the environmental requirements of
10	opening such a pit were waived, meaning that
11	hazardous materials, ranging from asbestos to
12	machinery to white goods, are soaking in that
13	water, many of which were burned, causing that much
14	more of an effect on the water that's being
15	requested to be pumped out.
16	Second in that is that the pit does not
17	have a license at the moment and has never obtained
18	a license under the normal, I guess you say, the
19	regular permitting request. The necessary studies
20	related to the property have never been done. In
21	effect, they are saying, "We're going to pump the
22	water out, and then we're going to start dumping it
23	on the site again." They're dumping in a site that
24	doesn't have a permit. The permit was done for

25

1

35

So, even if they pump it out tomorrow, what's the Page 31

emergency reasons, none of which exist right now.

2	good of it. They can't do anything with the pit.
3	Legally, they can't.
4	The next is environmental impacts, and I
5	think the reason we're here tonight is the
6	environmental impact that's going to occur if the
7	water is pumped out into the local marshes, onto
8	these people's lands and into the Calcasieu Lake.
9	Like I said, we need to look at the
10	procedural posture of this permit, and, if drained,
11	can they even begin dumping in this pit right now
12	anyway? The answer to that is no. The pit is not
13	and has never been permitted as a standard C and D
14	disposal site. According to D.E.Q.'s own web site,
15	they have a list of all the sites that are
16	permitted. This is not one of those sites. This
17	is regardless of whether or not the permit is dry -
18	- I mean, whether or not the pit is dry or not.
19	Based upon the fact that the soil at the site
20	is so porous, it's not full because of rain that's
21	in the site. It's full because it's next to a
22	marsh. Everybody knows if you did a hole out
23	there, you better do whatever you're going to do

today and it doesn't rain for the next month, it
will still be full in two days. That shows the
kind of ground that everybody is working that
everybody has out there. An engineer can say what Page 32

quick because it only takes about a half a day and

it's full of water again. If they pump it out

5	they want; common folks usually know what they're
6	living on. It's very porous property, and it's
7	next to a marsh.
8	Like I said, the pit was allowed under the
9	guise of an emergency or disaster situation. The
10	pit was opened under emergency order, and as a
11	result of such, many of the dumping standards were
12	waived or they were relaxed. Rightfully so. It
13	was a tough situation. It was a tough time, and we
14	had to have a place to deal with all the extra
15	trash. That doesn't give them the right to now
16	pump that trash on us.
17	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You're out of time.
18	MR. DEVALL: That's fine. I reserve time.
19	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do you want to come back?
20	MR. DEVALL: Yes, sir.
21	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Cathy Schnexider?
22	MS. SCHNEXIDER: My name is Cathy
23	Schnexider. I live at 8366 Joe Ledoux Road.
24	My concerns are with the capping and the
25	closure of the Mike Gilliam landfill. Requirements

for closure were as follows: "Final cover shall
consist of a minimum of 24 inches of silty clays
and 6 inches of top soil covered for supporting
vegetative growth; however, other covers that
provide a more practical answer and satisfy the
purposes of minimalizing fire hazzards, odors,
vector food, and harborage and infiltration of Page 33

degmeet

precipitation as well as discouraging scavenging and limiting erosion may be submitted for approval by the administrative authority. Final cover shall be completed within 90 days after final grades are reached."

They also have number 21. "The integrity of the grade and cap must be maintained for no less than three years after the date of administrative authorities' approval of the closure of the facility. Annual reports concerning the integrity of the cap shall be submitted to the office of Environmental Compliance, Surveillance Division, for a period of three years after closure."

On March 13th, 2008, Gilliam was sent a letter of corrective violations, which leads us to believe that in the year of 2007, after the pit had been closed, capping was not properly constructed. Top soils are not noted on the bore samples, and we

want to know, has a certified engineer been to the site to verify that it was properly closed? As of now, it shows that it is silty clay, which would allow toxic materials to seep out.

The violation is: "The respondent failed to comply with any of the provisions of the solid waste regulations or the terms and conditions of any permit granted or order issued in violation of LAC33:V11.901A. Specifically, the facility did not submit the annual report as outlined in the interim Page 34

operational plan and the facility did not have the site certified closed by a professional engineer." This violation was addressed on or about October 11th, 2007, as verified by correspondence dated October 11th, 2007. A copy of the annual report and a copy of the site being certified closed was submitted to the department.

We're concerned about how long had the water been seeping and leaking before all this took place and what toxins have been released in, and was it ever fixed, because we don't have any report on that. We also have it in a book if anybody cares to read it.

I live on Joe Ledoux Road. I was out here before the hurricane was out here. I was out here

after the hurricane. We would sit in our FEMA
camper, and we would watch the dump trucks. We had
to go out in our yard and pick up trash daily
because these dump trucks would travel down the
road at ungodly speeds and stuff would fly out. My
husband works at the plants, and some of the stuff
that was in the road, he wouldn't even allow me to
pick up until he went in with gloves and everything
to pick it up, and we'd put it in our trash can and
put it in bags, because it was bad. We didn't know
what it was.
So, I don't know what all was dumped out

there, but I know a lot of stuff that wasn't
Page 35

14	supposed to be dumped out there, and I'm like
15	Wayne, we have to buy our water. We have to spend
16	a lot of money on filter systems and everything
17	else. Our clothes don't smell good anymore. We
18	get stains from the water. It's scary. I don't
19	let me friends that come over to my house drink any
20	of the water or anything else. I just hope you
21	don't that you take this into consideration,
22	that we don't want it out there and that we're
23	scared. Thank you.
24	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Ronald Higginbotham?
25	MR. HIGGINBOTHAM: Hello. I'm Ronald
	40
1	Higginbotham. I live at 8600 Budstell Road, Lake
2	Charles, Louisiana. I'm representing south Lake
3	Charles Community here tonight. And I'm up here to
4	just simply ask if we can have an extension of time
5	from the June 23rd, 2008, if we could have just a
6	little bit of an extension of time.
7	MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm unable to grant you
8	any time. You'd have to make that request in
9	writing to D.E.Q.
10	MR. HIGGINBOTHM: Thank you. That's all
11	the time I need.
12	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Okay.
13	Mark Bergeron?
14	MR. BERGERON: I'm Mark Bergeron. I'm an

out there at the landfill. The people that live in Page 36

that area, I feel real sorry for what they're going

17

18	through. I think y'all really need to consider not
19	to let this pass and take care of these people
20	because it's not going to get any better. It's
21	going to get worse. Thank you.
22	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Preston Benoit?
23	MR. BENOIT: My name is Preston Benoit.
24	417 Parish Farm Road, Iowa, Louisiana. I was an
25	operator out at the pit. It was talk of linings.
	41
	41
1	I know of none that was put in place. There was a
2	whole bunch of stuff dumped out there, asbestos and
3	stuff. We was just like Joe and them; we were in
	·
4	the middle of everything. So, I'm really concerned
5	for the people that live around the area, because
6	like my uncle said, it ain't going to get no
7	better. It's going to get worse. Thank you.
8	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Roger Burgess?
9	MR. BURGESS: Roger Burgess. My address is
10	Post Office Drawer 7820, Lake Charles, Louisiana.
11	I'm with the law firm of Baggett, McCall, and
12	Burgess. I'm not going to be one of the popular
13	guys here today. I represent Mike Gilliam. I've
14	represented him for a long time.
15	Mr. Gilliam doesn't really have a big dog
16	in this particular hunt, but the thing that I'm
17	here to do he's in Atlanta, or he would be
18	talking for himself tonight. Mr. Gilliam did have
19	a permit. T. Claude, you said it, I think, very Page 37

degmeet

20	well. It was an emergency situation, and Mr.
21	Gilliam has been permitted for everything that was
22	put into the landfill. In fact, there is asbestos
23	in the landfill; no question about it. It is non-
24	friable. The reason I know about non-friable
25	asbestos is my law firm is a leading law firm in

representing people who have been exposed to asbestos. We represent people who have developed the most serious cancers as a result of being exposed to asbestos. We take it very seriously.

And I don't have any expertise to come tell you that I've been out there to check the landfill to make sure the D.E.Q. and E.P.A. were properly checking that landfill, but Mr. Gilliam relied on D.E.Q. and E.P.A. to make sure that what he was doing was in accordance with their rules and regulations.

Now, I represent him on the citations, and he has been cited; there's not question about it. The citations that we typically get when we are representing somebody like in the E.D.C. spill are millions and millions of dollars for their violations. In this particular case, the violations are for failure to fill out the forms properly that he should have, and Mr. Gilliam does not deny that in any way and is not trying to escape liability for not filling out the various forms and getting them to the D.E.Q. in an Page 38

23	appropriate or FEMA in an appropriate
24	fashion. He readily admits that some paperwork was
25	not done. Significant failure on paperwork runs
	43
1	you into hundreds of thousands and millions of
2	dollars-worth of penalties, and his penalties are
3	less than \$20,000.
4	It was a financial concern, and it was a
5	financial reward for him to utilize his property.
6	Unfortunately, I know there is now the folks
7	that are his neighbors are incensed by what is
8	going on. But Mr. Gilliam has asked me to come to
9	talk to you tonight to say, from his standpoint,
10	not that anybody cares what his standpoint is, from
11	his standpoint, is that he relied on the D.E.Q. and
12	the E.P.A. to make sure that what was put in the
13	landfill, emergency basis or not, was appropriate
14	and not going to be hazardous to his neighbors. He
15	has no expertise to make those determinations. So,
16	his position is, "With some exceptions on
17	paperwork, I abided by the law. I expected to be
18	checked. I expected to have folks going out and
19	taking a look at how much clay we put out there and
20	how much top soil is out there." Ultimately, his
21	desire has always been to comply, including doing
22	all the paperwork. That just didn't get done in a
23	appropriate fashion.
24	But I can tell you, Mr. Gilliam doesn't

But I can tell you, Mr. Gilliam doesn't want anybody's water to be contaminated. Mr. Page 39

44

1	Gilliam doesn't want anybody to have any kind of a
2	cancer threat.
3	One of the things that we do know about -
4	one of the things we do know about at Baggett
5	McCall are the risks that are involved in being
6	exposed to hazardous materials and then developing
7	serious disease as a result of it. So, I take it
8	really seriously. My thought is, that's one of the
9	things that D.E.Q. is going to have to make sure
10	of. The E.P.A. needs to make sure that there's not
11	going to be further contamination of any sort,
12	there's not going to be anything else that goes out
13	there that's going to hurt anybody. Mr. Gilliam
14	has no control over that, but that's what his
15	expectations are, that if there is a permit, that
16	there are going to be people who know what they're
17	doing, who are out there watching every minute.
18	Thank you.
19	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sherry Cormier?
20	MS. CORMIER: Hi. I'm Sherry Cormier. I
21	live at 1230 Rosetta Street in Lake Charles. The
22	last thing I expected to do tonight was talk. I
23	came because I love some people that live on Joe
24	Ledoux Road, and I'm worried about their situation.

25

After hearing some of the things that the other

1	side has said, now I'm even more worried. They're
2	not very comforting.
3	We live ten miles away. We fish at
4	Calcasieu Point. We crab there with our children.
5	We visit with the Schnexiders pretty often. We do
6	fun things at their house, barbeques and what not.
7	Since the hurricane, things have been
8	different. We would go for a barbeque, but we
9	would watch trucks go by with major debris. Things
10	that we knew we knew from common sense did
11	not belong in that dump. I remember asking Cathy,
12	"Who is watching? Who is doing this? Who is
13	paying attention?" Well, evidently somebody wasn't
14	because now there is a problem, but they want
15	everybody to feel okay about it.
16	So, this is what I have to say: These
17	people have lost their homes. They've lost
18	everything, and they've started all over again from
19	the ground up. They lived in little shoe boxes on
20	wheels. I think it's putting a double hardship on
21	these people to have to worry about the health of
22	their children and their spouses for the benefit of
23	somebody getting a profit, because that's what it
24	comes down to. It's the health of the neighborhood
25	and all their children and all the children that

46

	dagmaat
3	deqmeet live in Lake Charles. I have two children with a
4	disability that they think can be attributed to
5	things in the environment. I take this kind of
6	stuff very seriously, and when I heard that it was
7	possibly in the water, the shallow water, you got
8	my attention now. I would really beg you not to
9	allow this, please.
10	MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't have any more
11	sign-in sheets. Let's see. I'll recall Natalie
12	Robinson.
13	The same five-minute rule applies.
14	MS. ROBINSON: Okay. I know y'all don't
15	want to hear me talk for five more minutes on this,
16	but I'm Natalie Robinson. 8668 Budstell Road, Lake
17	Charles, Louisiana.
18	From what we understand, this dump is
19	needed for or will be used for the demolition of
20	the old Sears building, and we all know how old
21	that building is, and we are concerned, as far as
22	the asbestos issue in that situation, if it is used
23	and deposited there at this location.

plans to please this. We know that you can't
answer. We don't expect an answer from you, but
those are our concerns.
Who is going to do the monitoring, because
as we have seen before, there has been a lot of

pit, how -- we would like to know, "How D.E.Q.

With everything that's been said about the

degmeet

failure in different levels of monitoring. How often will the monitoring be done? When will the results of the tests be given? And if there is a problem, who will fix it? And how will the problem be re-mediated? That's what we would like to know.

At this point, we have -- we have environmentalists who are very concerned because of the testing. Of course, we did not have time to get tests back, and we are sending tests off, because they are concerned for the -- in our water, with levels of chromium six. I'm sure all of you have seen the show Erin Brockovich. Benzene, this is in our water. I take that back. I hope this is not in our water, but as -- on the record, the water out there is contaminated, and this is -- as a matter of fact, we have pictures of about 400 foot of hoses where they actually pumped this contaminated water onto my property. We have kids out there that hunt, fish. We do not allow the kids to swim in the ponds any more. They're not

allowed to eat the fish anymore.

Do you know what? Another thing that many of you may not know, but everyone in the community that was there, we had to wear masks when we went outside, day and night, because there was a light grayish film that covered our vehicles, our animals, us. We do have pictures of all of the asbestos that you say is not going to harm us

9	deqmeet because it was just deposited and not disturbed.
10	The asbestos was all burned. We have statements,
11	and we have pictures. So, how safe are our
12	children? Because, you now what, it's not about a
13	buck out there. We never disturbed Mr. Gilliam.
14	We were happy that he was one to actually you
15	know, he got in on something good. We never
16	disturbed him, but we didn't expect for us to have
17	to worry about our children's water, what they
18	drank down the road.
19	Thank you very much.
20	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Claude Devall?
21	MR. DEVALL: Thank you.
22	MR. KIRKPATRICK: The same rules apply.
23	MR. DEVALL: As I was saying, from a

24

25

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

49

a

before, in effect, what we are doing is putting the cart before the horse. This pit was allowed under the guise of emergency and disaster situation.

procedural standpoint, they're asking for a permit

for a pit that doesn't exist. As I was saying

As we stand here today, there is no evidence before this panel that has or will be offered to D.E.Q. by J.B.D., L.L.C., to prove or suggest in any way that this pit must be reopened due to a natural disaster or some emergency as was created by the hurricane. As a result of such, they don't have a right to put anything in the landfill as it is. That's from a procedural

deameet

12 standpoint.

Now what can be done is, they have to start this process over again. And that is, where they stand today, they should be first requesting the right to open a landfill, not to drain it and keep putting more dangerous things into it.

Chapter 7 of the D.E.Q. guidelines required that "any C and D landfill must have a standard permit." The reason for that standard permit is that they go through the normal process. They go through the testing process. They go through a lot fo different concerns which exist and that people can actually look into on a daily basis. It isn't during a hurricane whenever we needed somewhere to

put thousands of houses, and so we gave the bid to the first guy that came along. By doing what is being requested here is to bypass that process. You're bypassing the rights of the public and the D.E.Q. to have a right to test the different materials that are already out there and to actually address a lot of issues that everybody has addressed here tonight. One, can you even have such a permit in a flood zone? Should it be allowed? You know, one of the reasons for that flood zone is because in a hurricane everything is destroyed and there is debris everywhere. I'd say the best way to put debris everywhere and to ruin a place is by digging a big hole and filling it full

deqmeet of construction material and waiting for the water 15 16 to rise again. That in itself is a reason why it shouldn't, and through the right process, it won't 17 18 be approved. 19 The second is the fact there is pending 20

environmental concerns on the property already.

Next is, what real advantages will it have to the community? They're asking to open a halffilled, polluted dump site, and they're claiming that that's in the best interest of the community, as opposed to, if the dump site is needed, open a

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

51

brand-new one. There are other people that are requesting every day to have a site opened. They're not asking to have it opened in a marsh, in an area that is already full of asbestos, and it's already full of refrigerators, freon, and everything else.

I understand if there is an emergency, this isn't the way to answer it. It's not by taking the very worst of the different options and going this way. Under those emergency conditions they accepted materials as everybody said tonight that would normally not have been accepted. Washing machines. Air conditioners. As I said, there is a gas tank that I personally know that I brought there. They haven't explained where the entire mobile home that was sitting in the middle of the site went to. Now, I know after I saw it, there

18	deqmeet was a fire not long after that, and based upon
19	anything you could see, it was burned right there
20	on site. They didn't take it apart. I would be
21	surprised if they took anything out of it. The
22	whole mobile home, along with asbestos and
23	everything else, was lit on fire.
24	The next and, really, this all comes

25

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

52

even the opening of the site, but it's just a simple draining of that water. And the water that they're asking to pump into these folks yards and into the lake is full of oil, it's full of coolants, and it's the remains of treated lumber and asbestos that's been burned. At the very least, that lumber is going to have arsenic in it.

back to -- what's in that site comes back to, not

Now, I understand the lady had a good point earlier. Is it really the best thing to do to just let it sit there. I don't think the answer to that is yes, either. According to Title 33 of the Environmental Regulatory Code posted on the D.E.Q. website, it's very clear. We shouldn't be looking at how to drain the burn pit in out waterways, and we shouldn't be looking into exactly how Mr. Gilliam's going to pump this out and how it's going to start a new site. What we should be looking into is how he's going to clean it up, how he's going to get the water out of it, and how we're going to cover this up to where water doesn't hold

in it anymore. Part 6 addresses that, and it's real clear. It's called the "Inactive and Abandoned Hazardous Substance Site Remediation."

Like I said, the first lady says there are two options, and that's not true. There's a third

П

24

25

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

53

option. The third option is to clean it up like it should be done, and it's real clear in the statute. Title 33, Part 6, shows a way of notice for Mr. Gilliam and it also addresses R.S. 30 and 22:75. What should be happening under those statutes is that at this time, he should be getting notice of a hearing to remediate this land. It shouldn't be to reopen it. At which time, he should be required to have the water removed. It should be removed by trucks to a water treatment facility. It should be removed, but not into our ditches. Second, it's to stop the bleeding of the damage that's already been caused. That's not going to be by putting more trash on top of it and, more than anything, letting it keep sinking and going lower and leeching into our drinking water and into the lake.

On behalf of the citizens in the area, I'd ask that not only the permit be denied but that the site is cleaned up like it is supposed to be under D.E.Q. rules, is that the -- then they have a lot of different reasons to do that. One is the concern of the citizens. The second is the proof of the damage that's already been caused. It's the

24	deqmeet proof of the damage that will be caused along with
25	the procedural nature of the permit and it's
	54
1	prematurity and the fact that, legally, they don't
2	have the right to be dumping any waste or anything
3	in this environment even if they do get the drain
4	tomorrow. Thank you.
5	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other
6	comments?
7	Did you sign in?
8	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.
9	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You need to.
10	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Do I need to sign
11	in right now?
12	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can get up and talk
13	until I that's okay. You don't have to go
14	around the planet to get here.
15	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't? I can talk
16	right there?
17	MR. KIRKPATRICK: No. You have to come up
18	here.
19	MS. JOHNSON: Teresa Johnson. 8764
20	Budstell Road. I do live out there, and I did lose
21	everything, and the one thing I want people to
22	understand, we chose to live there. It may be
23	marsh to some people, but it is our homes, and when
24	we say "flood zone," we're not talking about an

25

inch of flood water. It was five foot in our

□ 55

1	house. We totally lost everything. So, to put a
2	land disposal in a flood zone, to me, is just
3	unheard of. Thank you.
4	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other
5	comments?
6	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: I'd like to present a
7	document. Can I come back up?
8	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Certainly.
9	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: Is that legal?
10	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sure. That's what we're
11	here for. If you want to submit an exhibit, just
12	say so, and we'll mark it and do all that stuff.
13	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm sure we'll be
14	sending you all of this.
15	My name is Nancy Higginbotham. I live at
16	8600 Budstell Road. We've been talking about all
17	the chemicals and the hazardous materials that are
18	in this pit, and how it is not line properly and
19	how porous and pervious this soil is and just how
20	easily we hit water. I want to talk about some of
21	the things some of the measurements from Mr.
22	Gilliam's report this is in one of his annual
23	reports about the amount that was dumped in this
24	pit. This is reported on July 1st, '06, through
25	June 30th, 2007. For wood waste, he has 7,780

56

1 tons. Tipping, which I'm not sure what tipping is, Page 50

2	he has 9,164.4 tons. What upsets me the most,
3	friable asbestos, 6,480 tons. That's in a pit that
4	is porous, that has been burned, and what's not
5	monitored by proper air control. My son, at 13
6	years old, gets up every morning of his Christmas
7	break at five o'clock in the morning to put his
8	waders on to go hunting in these marshes. I now
9	have to tell him, "You can't hunt," "You can't
10	fish," "You can't crab," "You can't swim in your
11	pond," "You can't train your hunting dog," because
12	if he goes in that pond, he may be contaminated.
13	We have lost our way of life. We talk about the
14	Friday night fais do-do, all the music, the fun,
15	the crawfish boils. This is how we live. Everybody
16	out there, we're a very strong, close-knit
17	community. All I want to say is, please take into
18	consideration our culture, our children, our
19	environment, our complete way of life before you
20	allow this waste water to be drained off into our
21	environment and completely take away what we know
22	as Louisiana. Thank you.
23	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other
24	comments?
25	Did you want to submit an exhibit?
	57
	57
1	MS. HIGGINBOTHAM: I used the term
2	"submit." I meant to
3	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you can mail it in

_	M3. HIGGINDOTHAM. I used the term
2	"submit." I meant to
3	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you can mail it in
4	Please tell us your name and all that.

5	MS. HARDY: My name is Tammie Hardy. 8530
6	Joe Ledoux Road.
7	We ask everybody to come by and look at the
8	pictures that we do have. We have some very
9	incriminating pictures that will just totally
10	disgust everybody. But this one particularly
11	caught my eye, because this is a picture of the
12	exposed asbestos from 5/09/2007 that is now sitting
13	under the water, which parts of this need to be
14	drained off. This asbestos is exposed. This
15	picture was taken from the D.E.Q. Thank you.
16	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other
17	comments?
18	MS. WEEKS: I have one more comment.
19	I would just like to pose a question
20	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your name and address?
21	MS. WEEKS: I'm sorry. Debbie Weeks. 8538
22	Joe Ledoux Road. By the way, I've lived out there
23	for 18 years. I would just like to know how the
24	question posed by I know that a lot of things
25	are permitted under emergency situations for the
	58
1	pit. But I've been told by several different
2	people in the know that white goods, and I take
3	that to mean, as it was exposed to me,
4	refrigerators, freezers, washing machines, and
5	other things that contain Freon and stuff like that
6	I was told by numerous people that, that pit was

never permitted to house any white goods. Now, Page 52

8	that was the one thing that was not allowed in that
9	pit. We have heard people tonight talk about the
10	fact that they themselves put white goods in that
11	dump, and that I just wanted to know if that was
12	ever permitted, or am I wrong about that?
13	MR. KIRKPATRICK: This isn't a question and
14	answer format.
15	MS. WEEKS: Okay.
16	MR. KIRKPATRICK: This is just to get your
17	
18	MS. WEEKS: Okay. Well, it was just a
19	concern.
20	MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can call and ask.
21	MS. WEEKS: Thank you.
22	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, ma'am.
23	Are there any other comments?
24	well, are you going to speak?
25	MR. BOURQUE: Yes. Yes. Joseph Bourque.

8639 Joe Ledoux Road. I would like everybody to
know that we have not just moved out there. Most
of all of us have been out there for 37, 40 years.
We've personally been there for $37\ \text{years}$, back when
it was nothing but soybean fields and flood lands.
None of this disaster stuff was even out there. No
sign of dirt pits out there. Nothing. That's who
I'm really recognizing. We have a picture showing
the hoses dumping onto our property, which water
was dumped out onto our land where our horses have Page 53

11	been suffering, and the ones that have died, they
12	were out there by that. If you would like to look
13	at it, it will be up here with all our exhibits,
14	also.
15	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are you going to submit
16	that as an exhibit?
17	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are y'all going to keep
18	them?
19	MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.
20	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, we'll make copies.
21	MR. BOURQUE: We'll have to make you a copy
22	and mail it to you.
23	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We'll Fed-Ex all of this
24	to you.
25	MR. KIRKPATRICK: That's fine. I mean, if
	60
1	you want to submit it as an exhibit, I'll receive
2	it and mark it as such, you know, and it will go in
3	the public record.
4	MR. BOURQUE: Second of all, I would like
5	to see test holes done. The newspaper said there
6	was 300 bore samples. There was three. Out of the
7	three bore samples, none of them went through the
8	trash. Zero. It was all in dirt. I personally
9	live right on the property. I'm right there. I
10	would like to see 300 bore samples in the trash, or
11	I would like to see a track hoe go out there and
12	dig to my specifications, where at the ground, and

let's see what's in that trash. Would y'all like Page 54

14	to do that? Just set a track hoe up out there.
15	I'll point in the ground where to dig a hole and
16	let's dig it.
17	I didn't think so. Thank you.
18	MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right. Any other
19	comments? Going once, twice, three times.
20	I remind you that the comment period for
21	the Draft Water Discharge Permit for J.B.D.,
22	L.L.C., 8222 Highway 90, Roanoke, Louisiana 70581
23	to discharge contact storm water from their J.B.D.
24	Construction and Demolition Landfill ends at 12:30
25	p.m., Monday June 23rd, 2008.
	61
1	All comments receive, requests for
2	notification of the final decision and the
3	transcript from the hearing are processed by the
4	Public Participation Group and are available on
5	E.D.M.S.
6	The permit writer reviews all comments and
7	uses any additional information that is appropriate
8	to update the permitting information.
9	The names and address of all the
10	commentors, speakers and those requesting to be
11	notified of the final decision are added to the
12	public comment database.
13	A final draft of the permit and the
14	response to the public comments are prepared and
15	forwarded to the Office of Environmental Services

Assistant Secretary for final decision.
Page 55

17	Upon the issuance of the permit, a litter
18	is mailed to all the commentors, speakers, and
19	those who requested to be notified of a final
20	decision or the denial of the permit, I should
21	have put that in there. The final decision
22	includes the appeal process, the basis of decision
23	and the response to all the public comments
24	received.
25	There are no I have received no exhibits
	62
1	during this hearing.
2	If there are no other comments, thank you
3	for attention and participation in the hearing.
4	Let the record reflect that the time is
5	7:45 p.m. This hearing is closed.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

202122232425